

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

## PPDC Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics WG - Meeting Minutes

10/11/2017

### Attendees:

(in person) Mike Goodis, Lead, Meredith Laws, Tom Steeger, Dee Colby;  
(call-in) Stephanie Binns (for Aaron Hobbs), Ray Brinkmeyer, Michele Colopy, Jim Fredericks, Rose Kachadoorian, Don Parker, Peg Perrault, Caydee Savinelli, Julie Shapiro, Robin Shepard, Al Summers, Tom Van Arsdall, Andy Whittington, Tony Cofer (invited guest), Liza Fleeson-Trossbach (invited guest), Cary Giguere (invited guest)

### Agenda (attached)

#### Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review – Mike Goodis/Dee Colby

Mike Goodis (EPA) welcomed callers, including invited representatives from State Lead Agencies (SLA).

#### Review of Meeting Minutes from September 13, 2017 – Dee Colby

Meeting minutes were finalized from the September meeting and will be posted on the PPDC website.

#### Report from SFIREG from September 18 Committee Session – Liza Fleeson-Trossbach

Liza Fleeson-Trossbach (Virginia) and Cary Giguere (Vermont) reported feedback from the State FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group (SFIREG) Pesticide Operations and Management (POM)/Environmental Quality (EQI) JOINT WORKING COMMITTEE based on Liza's presentation of "*Measuring MP3s – PPDC Workgroup Survey*". She pointed out to the committee that there is flexibility within the questionnaire to accommodate differences across states regarding managed pollinator protection plans (MP3s) and that there would not be any scoring of MP3s. There were no direct concerns regarding the use of a questionnaire as a means of gauging activity. States appreciated the opportunity to provide input into the process of evaluating MP3 at a national level.

#### MP3 Metrics Workgroup Evaluation Questionnaire – Ray Brinkmeyer

Refer to the Presentation/Questionnaire attached.

Slide 15: A question was asked whether answers about pesticide-related bee kill (Survey Question 7) are subject to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) inquiries? The scores could be FOIA'd. Most states operate in a very transparent way; however, there is much concern by states over possible scoring and ranking of states over MP3s that are voluntary. SLA pointed out that states assess their own plans...this national metric is not for states. The Workgroup and SLA revisited discussions about scoring and comparing individual states. The conversation came back to EPA looking at the responses to questions collectively. A Workgroup member noted the states' willingness to be transparent is encouraging, but understood concerns regarding comparisons. However, if the information is being used to reduce the effect to which label restrictions are waived/avoided, the process needs to be transparent. Mike Goodis pointed out that it was never the intent of the Agency to single out states, but the EPA would like to know which states respond to the survey. Pollinators are an important issue and the Agency needs to be able to show that MP3s/state plans are part of the solution. The Workgroup and SLA need to find the best middle ground. All agreed that perceptions of the plans are important.

Slide 16: Mike Goodis suggested prefacing the "Survey Scoring" talking points by reminding the PPDC that each state had flexibility in developing their plan, as such, plans are very diverse. An aggregate score for

success of MP3s is an attempt to normalize the plan-diversity to present the information to the public. Along those lines, the Workgroup envisions assessment of each question as a total percentage of tallied responses for each answer category (e.g., states completing the survey answered 65% yes, 30% no, 5% unknown). This type of evaluation is then just a gathering of the information. This should relieve some of the concern brought up in the discussion about Slide 15 because the aggregated score is all anyone will see. No ranking would be revealed if the survey results were requested through FOIA; SLA agreed. SLA stated that there is no concern over responses, only ranking by responses. The Workgroup should include an example of the aggregated scoring during the presentation to the PPDC.

Slide 17: The Workgroup questioned if this slide should stay in the presentation. There are concerns about:

- 1) Who will manage the questionnaire;
- 2) Who will analyze the responses;
- 3) What information will be sent to the EPA and from whom; and,
- 4) What mechanism will there be for re-working questions?

SLA responded that once the questions are vetted, the Association of American Pesticide Control Officials (AAPCO) and SFIFREG will work together to get the questionnaire to the Regions. Details for administering the questionnaire, analyzing and sending information to the EPA can be worked out over time. It may be necessary to revive analytics versions of Survey Monkey accounts. Future considerations regarding the questionnaire process will be discussed with SFIFREG/AAPCO.

Survey Question edits and discussions:

2c: Change from “formal evaluation” to “Has your agency or another entity evaluated your state plan based on metrics or....?”

7: Change the word “direct” to “potential”. An explanation may need to accompany this question. There was some uncertainty as to why this particular question is included in the questionnaire. Is the question about specific investigations or is the question asking if measures for direct pesticide exposure to bees are in states’ plans? It was suggested that options for answers include: yes, and measures are included in the plan; yes, but measures are not part of the plan; no; or, unknown.

#### **Wrap Up and October 31st In-Person Meeting – Mike Goodis**

The Workgroup indicated that 75 minutes will be enough time for the group to present and field questions during the PPDC meeting in November. The Workgroup will need volunteers to present to the full PPDC. Mike Goodis reminded the Workgroup that their presentation is intend to determine if the full PPDC wants to formally recommend the metric (i.e., questionnaire) to the EPA. Mike suggested that the presenters ask the PPDC to hold any questions until the end of the presentation.

Dee Colby will determine how many of the PPDC members are new in order to gauge how much background information should be included in the presentation. Mike may be able to discuss some of the background leading to the development of MP3s and need for a national metric.

The Workgroup’s In-Person meeting will be from 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. EST on October 31, here in Arlington. A call-in option will be available for this meeting.

Note: The full PPDC meets November 1-2, 2017...Check the PPDC website for information pertaining to their November 1-2 meeting.

## PPDC Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics Workgroup

Call-In Meeting 10/11/2017 2:00-3:30 pm EST

1-866-299-3188; 703-347-8657

Adobe connect:

<http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/r98hwnfnui4/>

The objective of this meeting is to begin to finalize the proposed questionnaire and scoring of the questionnaire for presentation to the full PPDC in November 2017.

### **Agenda:**

#### **Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review – Mike/Dee (5 min)**

*Workgroup members and participants will introduce themselves.*

#### **Review of Meeting Minutes from September 13, 2017 - Dee (5 min)**

*Finalize meeting minutes from the September meeting.*

#### **Report from SFIREG from September 18 Committee Session – Liza Fleeson-Trossbach (10 min)**

*Liza will report feedback from her presentation to SFIREG POM/EQI JOINT WORKING COMMITTEE on “Measuring MP3s – PPDC Workgroup Survey”.*

#### **MP3 Metrics Workgroup Evaluation Questionnaire – Ray Brinkmeyer (60 min)**

- 1. Workgroup members will begin to finalize the proposed metric, including scoring.*
- 2. Members will discuss presentation of the metric to the full PPDC and select someone to serve as spokesperson for the Workgroup.*

#### **Wrap Up and October 31st In-Person Meeting – Mike (10 min)**

*The Workgroup’s In-Person meeting will be from 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. EST on October 31, here in Arlington. A call-in option will be available for this meeting.*

**Note:** *The full PPDC meets on November 1-2, 2017...Check the PPDC website for information pertaining to their November 1-2 meeting.*

# MP3 Metrics PPDC Workgroup Summary

October 11, 2017

# MP3 Metrics PPDC Workgroup Summary

- ▶ Workgroup Charge and Member Representatives
- ▶ Process - Evaluation of MP3s
  - ▶ Problem Definition
  - ▶ MP3 Review
  - ▶ National Level Metrics Guidance
  - ▶ Implementation
- ▶ Feedback from PPDC
- ▶ Backup Slides
  - ▶ Survey Questions

# Workgroup Charge

- ▶ The expectation for the workgroup is to develop:
  - ▶ 1) Recommendations for EPA to use in evaluating the effectiveness of pollinator protection plans at a national level; a means to monitor how well they are doing overall
  - ▶ 2) A strategy to communicate that effectiveness to the public. We will refer to 'public' in a broad definition.
  - ▶ The Agency views the outcomes of this work as a long term effort to look at trends versus a specific target.
- ▶ The WG commenced - November 2016

# Workgroup Member Representatives

## Please confirm list

- ▶ There are 21 members on the workgroup representing a wide range of stakeholders including: beekeepers, growers, States, tribes, industry, NGOs, and consultants.
- ▶ American Beekeepers Federation, American Honey Producers, Beyond Pesticides, Collaborate Up, Dow, FLDACS, EPA - Region 8, Honey Bee Health Coalition, MS Farm Bureau, NASDA, National Cotton Council, NPMA, Oregon Dept. of Ag, Pollinator Partnership, Pollinator Stewardship Council, R.I.S.E., State Apiarist Inspectors, Syngenta, USDA



# Process - Evaluation of State & Tribal MP3s

## Problem Definition of Plans

- States & Tribal Nations - Working with stakeholders to promote pollinator health.
- Plans: Reduce exposure of bees to pesticides & develop local mitigation measures.
- EPA to develop metrics for evaluating the efficacy of these plans on a national basis.

## MP3 Review

- What is the scope of each MP3?
- What are the areas of commonality across MP3s for national-level metrics?
- Do the MP3s identify metrics for evaluating success?

## National-Level Metrics Guidance

- Identify metrics that can be used for a national-level evaluation of MP3s.
- Identify specific metrics to recommend to the PPDC.
- Identify processes for gathering information for national-level evaluation.

## Implementation

- Identify process for providing states/tribes feedback on metric process.
- Develop strategy to communicate national-level metrics to the broader public.
- Identify possible time line for evaluating metrics.

# MP3 Review



# MP3 Review Summary

- ▶ **All available MP3 plans were reviewed**
- ▶ **Common Themes Identified**
  - ▶ Focus on enhancing communication between stakeholders
  - ▶ Focus on enhancing education & knowledge
    - ▶ Pollinators, Pesticide Stewardship, Pollinator Forage & Habitat
  - ▶ Best management practices
- ▶ **Differences**
  - ▶ Recognized great diversity among plans
  - ▶ Recognized differences in local stakeholders
- ▶ **Other Themes**
  - ▶ Some MP3 are very comprehensive, some focus more on beekeepers and pesticide applicators/users
  - ▶ State plans are voluntary and rely heavily on local cooperation between and across stakeholders

# National-Level Metrics Guidance

- ▶ Developed a 5 Step process for national metrics
- ▶ Steps 1 to 4 - Presented today
- ▶ Steps 5 - Take place post survey



# National-Level Metrics Guidance

Step 1: Considerations



Step 2: Assessment Categories



Step 3: State MP3 Survey



Step 4: Survey Scoring



Step 5: Data Collection & Results

# National-Level Metrics Guidance

## Step 1: Considerations

- ▶ Need to have a mechanism to evaluate effectiveness of MP3s at a national level.
- ▶ Need to have comparable measures across states.
- ▶ Scoring will be at a national level and not compared between states.
- ▶ Survey tool will be used and there is a need to have a group to conduct the survey and collect results.
- ▶ Communicate effectiveness of the plans to the “public”

## Step 2: Assessment Categories

- ▶ These categories were common across majority of MP3s
  - ▶ Communication
  - ▶ Best Management Practices or Standard Operating Procedures
  - ▶ Stakeholders
  - ▶ Education
  - ▶ Progress Measures or Behavior Changes

## Step 3 - State MP3 Survey

- ▶ Worked with State Lead Agency (SLA) on development of survey questions.
  - ▶ Overall content of proposed questions remain intact.
  - ▶ Some tweaks & additions were made to the questions.
- ▶ Reviewed updated questions with SLA



# Step 3 - State MP3 Survey Questions Summary

## ► Communication

- Methods to increase communication between pesticide users and beekeepers

## ► Best Management Practices or Standard Operating Procedures

- Developed to reduce pollinator exposure to pesticides.
- List of BMPs and SOPs - i.e. - Communication, Pesticide Risk, Crop Producers, Beekeepers, Pollinator Forage & Habitat

# Step 3 - State MP3 Survey Questions Summary

## ► Education

- Coordination with other agencies, extension, NGOs, etc.
- Outreach on honey bee exposure to pesticides, proper crop & pest product selection and pesticide label comprehension
- Methods used for outreach, i.e. - Websites, Educational Materials etc.

## ► Stakeholders

- Groups reached - Agricultural and Non-agricultural
- Yearly stakeholder meeting

## Step 3 - State MP3 Survey Questions Summary

- ▶ Progress Measures or Behavior Changes
  - ▶ Reduction on pesticide related verified bee kills - **FOIA Question**
  - ▶ Measure of direct pesticide exposure to bees - collecting data in pollen or other substrate
  - ▶ Methods to assess pesticide exposure, increase communication or educational efforts
  - ▶ List of measures states are using to actively track success
    - ▶ Examples - National honey bee surveys, state surveys, increased adoption of BMPs, increase in communication and education on pesticide exposure
    - ▶ Funding for any of the listed measures

## Step 4 - Survey Scoring

- ▶ States will not be scored on the individual surveys
  - ▶ This is a self assessment tool by the state lead agencies
- ▶ Scoring System
  - ▶ Based on total number of responses for each category
  - ▶ Based on percent of total of responses for each category
    - ▶ Mechanism to capture current and future effectiveness
  - ▶ Comments and Examples - Summarized and tagged
- ▶ EPA can use the information to devise an **internal** national score.

## Step 5 - Data Collection & Results

- ▶ AAPCO is offering to utilize SFIREG to facilitate the distribution and return of the survey.
- ▶ SFIREG to electronically distribute the survey (via Survey Monkey) to the 10 Regional SFIREG Representatives.
- ▶ The Regional Representatives would in turn work with the States in their respective regions to complete the survey. Survey results would then be forwarded to EPA.
- ▶ AAPCO's Pollinator Workgroup may be able to help with data analysis and presentation.

## Step 6 - Public Communication

- ▶ EPA will report results to the public
- ▶ AAPCO's Pollinator Workgroup may be able to help with data analysis and presentation.

# Discussion MP3 WG

- ▶ FOIA Question
- ▶ Implementation of survey
- ▶ Publicize results

# Feedback from PPDC





# Backup Slides - Survey Questions

# Communication

- ▶ **1a. Does your state have a method to increase communication between pesticide users and beekeepers?**
  - ▶ Yes, No, Somewhat
  - ▶ Please explain or provide comments

# Communication

- ▶ **1b. If you answered “yes” or “somewhat” to 1a, what method was used to increase in communication been achieved? (Please check all that apply)**
  - ▶ Pesticide users and beekeeper developed SOPs or BMPs
  - ▶ FieldWatch, DriftWatch or similar mapping program
  - ▶ Flags
  - ▶ Meetings
  - ▶ Website
  - ▶ Other\_\_\_\_\_

# Best Management Practices or Standard Operating Procedures

- ▶ **2a. Have Best Management Practices (BMPs) or Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) been developed to reduce pollinator exposure to pesticides?**
  - ▶ Yes, No, Somewhat
  - ▶ Please give examples of what has been shared

# Best Management Practices or Standard Operating Procedures

- ▶ **2b. If you answered “yes” or somewhat for BMPs or SOPs, please check all that apply.**
  - ▶ Communication between beekeepers and pesticide applicators
  - ▶ Pesticide Risk to Pollinators
  - ▶ Stakeholder Engagement
  - ▶ Crop Producers
  - ▶ Pesticide Applicators
  - ▶ Beekeepers
  - ▶ Landscape / Nursery Industry
  - ▶ Urban / Homeowners
  - ▶ Pollinator Forage and Habitat
  - ▶ Other\_\_\_\_\_

# Best Management Practices or Standard Operating Procedures

- ▶ **2c. Have you or another stakeholder party conducted a formal evaluation of the MP3 plan?**
  - ▶ Yes - Self Evaluation or Yes - 3<sup>rd</sup> Party
  - ▶ If yes, what were some of the key learnings as related to the MP3 process and utilization?
  - ▶ Comments\_\_\_\_\_

# Education

► **3. Are you coordinating activities or trainings with other agencies, university-extension or NGOs within your state?**

► Yes, No, Somewhat

► Comments\_\_\_\_\_

# Education

- ▶ **4a. Has there been outreach on how honey bees are exposed to pesticides and/or proper crop & pest product selection and/or pesticide label comprehension?**
  - ▶ Yes, No, Somewhat
  - ▶ Please explain which of the above topics have been addressed via outreach.



# Education

- ▶ **4b. What methods were used for outreach? (Please check all that apply)**
  - ▶ Websites
  - ▶ Webinars
  - ▶ Educational Materials
  - ▶ Training Sessions - Extension etc.
  - ▶ Radio
  - ▶ Farm shows, county fairs, beekeeper meetings etc.
  - ▶ Other\_\_\_\_\_

# Stakeholders

- ▶ **4c. Has there been a yearly stakeholder meeting?**
  - ▶ Yes, No
  - ▶ Please explain or provide comments

# Stakeholders

## ► 4d. Stakeholder groups reached: (Please check all that apply)

### ► Agricultural

- Certified applicators
- Noncertified applicators
- Crop Consultants
- University Extension
- State Apiarists
- Commercial Beekeepers
- Others\_\_\_\_\_

### ► Non-agricultural/Urban

- Certified applicators
- Noncertified applicators
- Homeowners
- Mosquito Control
- State / Local Beekeeping Associations
- Others\_\_\_\_\_

### ► Comments \_\_\_\_\_

### ► Number of people reached: \_\_\_\_\_

# Progress Measures or Behavior Changes

- ▶ **5. How is your state documenting the impact of changes in behavior on reducing pesticide exposure? (Please check all that apply)**
  - ▶ Changes in pesticide incident reporting
  - ▶ Participation of stakeholders in relevant training/webinar/other
  - ▶ Incorporation of MP3 content into continuing education
  - ▶ Downloading of materials from the website
  - ▶ Others\_\_\_\_\_
  - ▶ N/A - Please explain
- ▶ Comments\_\_\_\_\_

# Progress Measures or Behavior Changes

- ▶ **6. Has there been a reduction in pesticide-related verified bee kills?**
  - ▶ Yes, No, Unknown
  - ▶ Comments\_\_\_\_\_
- ▶ **Discussion relative to FOIA of answers**

# Progress Measures or Behavior Changes

- ▶ **7. Is your state (SLA or university) attempting to measure direct pesticide exposure to bees, by collecting data documenting the frequency or level of pesticides detected in pollen or other substrate; or by some other means?**
  - ▶ Yes, No, Unknown
  - ▶ Comments\_\_\_\_\_

# Progress Measures or Behavior Changes

- ▶ **8. If applicable, please comment on methods to:**
  - ▶ Assess pesticide exposure
  - ▶ Increase communication
  - ▶ Increase educational efforts
  - ▶ Comments\_\_\_\_\_

# Progress Measures or Behavior Change

- ▶ **9a. Which of the following measurements of success does your state actively utilize to track success? Check all that apply.**
  - ▶ Relying on the results of existing and currently collected honey bee data by federal agencies and national organizations. Data from the USDA-NASS report and the Bee Informed Partnership report.
  - ▶ Relying on the results of state initiated pollinator health surveys.
  - ▶ Increased adopted of BMPs and SOPs by pesticide applicators and beekeepers.
  - ▶ Increase in communication between pesticide applicators and beekeepers
  - ▶ An increased level of understanding of how bees are exposed to pesticides
  - ▶ An increased level of understanding of how product selection can protect pollinators
  - ▶ An increased level of understanding of pesticide label comprehension by pesticide users
  - ▶ Reduction in pesticide-related verified bee kills
  - ▶ Reduction in the frequency and level of pesticides detected in pollen or other substrates.
  - ▶ Other\_\_\_\_\_



# Progress Measures or Behavior Change

- ▶ **9b. Please describe funding sources for any of the above checked categories.**

- ▶ Comments\_\_\_\_\_